HIGHER EDUCATION INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE
Sub Committee of IDAHO COUNTIL FOR TECHNOLOGY IN LEARNING (ICTL)
December 13, 2000 Meeting
Approved Minutes

Bow, Randy, **not present**	Kennedy, Ed	Simpson, Corey
Brady, Christine, **not present**	Krun, Lynda	Sommer, Jamie
Burton, DeVere, **not present**	Lay, Terry	Szofran, Nancy
Coleman, Carolyn	Lyons, Tom, **not present**	Terrio, Dan
Graves, Gary	Merritt, Sherawn	Thorsen, Carolyn
Green, Cliff, **not present**	O'Neill, Dave	Tuchscherer, Gary
Hammon, Darrel	Richardson, Senator Melvin	Wilde, Glenn
Johnson, Gens	Rood, Christi	Wilson, Dawn
Joslin, Ann	Sammons, Dotty	

Meeting began 10 a.m. Ann Joslin reviewed the agenda. Items added to the agenda were: update on IDANET, Technology Showcase, Telecommunications Policy, and Microwave analog. Changes to the minutes were: Terry Lay was present at the last meeting, page 2 change Lewis and Clark to Lewis-Clark, the current contract in November, changes to legislation-designating a leading agency for GIS.

Motion #1: Glenn Wilde moved the minutes be accepted as written, with changes included. Gens Johnson seconded the motion. Vote was taken and passed unanimously.

Updates:
IDANET – Nancy Szofran: The proposals were evaluated and opportunities for partnerships throughout the State were discussed. There may be multiple RFPs (Request For Proposals). The creation of the RFP will probably be "fill in the gaps," pieces that have been identified. The meetings were very positive. Every agency will have an equal opportunity to participate in the RFP process and creation.

Technology Showcase – Nancy Szofran: the presentations went extremely well, with standing room only. Glenn Wilde organized the presentations. Thank you Glenn for all the work you have done.

Glenn Wilde gave a brief update on the showcase: The term Digital Apartheid was chosen because it means something more than a digital divide between rural and urban areas. It will include urban areas that do not have access to telecommunications, public schools, library information, and agency resources, as well as those in the rural areas without connections.

The Albertson's Foundation presented an update on their involvement in public school, such as special classrooms. Gens Johnson presented what Idaho Public Television could do to reach 83-90% of the population using broadcast through digital and microwave bandwidth.

Glenn also discussed the task forces that are solving problems for Idaho, identified some of those problems, and bridging the gaps. There were a lot of questions that created discussions after the presentations. There was a good mix of people who attended representing businesses, trainers, education, and individuals from all walks of life.

Continuing this type of showcase next year was discussed, with some new ideas, such as having the Digital Apartheid as a keynote. It was suggested to bring in Linda Roberts as a keynote speaker, followed by a group of panelists responding to her, expanding the forum, and making this a focus event. HEITC would like to see public education involved more next year. Glenn Wilde will contact Nancy Echols on next year's showcase.

Intellectual Property Rights – Jimmie Sommer has been hired to work with the State Board on developing the Intellectual Property Rights Policy. Jimmie reviewed a handout on the intellectual property rights policy research, and gave a brief description of her progress. To assist in her research, Jimmie requested comments and suggestions on Intellectual Property Rights from the HEITC committee. She asked that each institution send the URL for their intellectual property rights policies.

There were several questions on Intellectual Property Rights, such as a proposal on content policy. It was suggested that copyright associated with intellectual property with the State Board of Education entities should be treated as a technology issue, and be filtered through the ICTL committee. This topic will be discussed at a future meeting. Education and non-education use of intellectual property also was discussed.

Technology Incentive Grant RFP – A final recommendation to the Board needs to be in by the April meeting. This RFP will be presented during the January 22-23 meeting. We would like to have it released and to the campuses immediately after that. The campuses will have a deadline of March 19, 2001 for the next round of requests. The funding decisions will be made at the April Board meeting.

It was suggested that this grant program have the following requirements: those who participate meet annually, share information learned in the process, begin developing a relationship (build partnerships and collaborations) among technology incentive grant recipients.

Gens Johnson read a report prepared by PBS (Public Broadcasting System) consultants, as they were evaluating the education market. The expense of creating on-line courses, attrition rates, and trends were discussed extensively.

Regional Technology Advisors Presentations (RTA):

Eddie Kennedy, College of Education, Moscow, ID – RTAs work throughout the state with K12, as well as working with institutions of higher education, and ICTL. RTAs review the District Technology Plans, required for district funding through the ICTL. The role of the RTAs is over and above their title and role at the university.

Eddie Kennedy is the Technology Coordinator in the College of Education. He administers and supervises the Idaho Technology Performance Assessment in Regions I and II, IV, and V. Eddie works as a liaison for faculty providing technology training, as well as supervising two trainers (one out of Moscow and one out of Coeur d'Alene) working with the K12 teachers in Regions I and II.

Dr. Heidi Rogers, College of Education, Coeur d'Alene, ID – has a doctorate in Curriculum and Design from Okalahoma State University. She has spent a couple of years teaching in Post Falls, and then became the director for the New Century Classroom, University of Idaho, Coeur d'Alene Center. She works with districts to meet their Goals2000/TLCF grant objectives, providing the training and background support the K12 teachers need in Region I. Heidi works with NIC, and has a staff member who trains there. She is an ICTL collaborating member to train teachers in K12, Region I, and is the International Society for Technology in Education (ISTE) President. (This is an organization that deals with educators.)

Dr. Scott Coleman, Lewis/Clark State College, ID – Scott's doctorate is in Instructional Technology from the University of Indiana. He is a professor at College of Education, Lewis/Clark State College, and an intern director for The Institutional Research. He is still teaching and works with pre-service and K12 teachers in Region II. Scott is in charge of the Technology for Teachers Program, a short-term training for teachers in regard to technology training. He is also the administrator for the State Technology Competency Exam, the Idaho Technology Performance Assessment.

Dr. Dotty Sammons, College of Education, Idaho State University, ID – has a Masters degree in Anthropology doctorate in Educational Technology from Utah State University. Dotty is a faculty member at Idaho State University doctorate in Instructional Technology from Idaho State University. Dotty works with faculty in technology outreach, who service's regions IV, V, and VI in training K12 teachers. She was an adjunct faculty member at ISU prior to this position.

Carolyn Thorsen oversees the Boise State University (BSU) State Technology Competency Assessment, works with the Educational Technology Masters program and undergraduate students, and is responsible for the technology internal infrastructure for the College of Education. She serves as the PT3 grant administrator. Prior to this, Carolyn served 16 years in K12 education.

Each RTA gave a brief description of the history, and outreach of their programs and work. There was a short question and answer session following the presentations. There was an extensive discussion on teacher training, and how technology is being integrated into the classroom and impacting the students. There have been several workshops for teachers in training and integration of technology in the classroom.

Senator Melvin Richardson gave a brief history of the ICTL, RTAs, technology integration in the schools, funding, and the cutback on teacher training (from $1,000,000.00 to $500,000.00). He suggested the need to fund a maintenance person in each school.

Some topics for discussion:
Integrating Technology into Classrooms: wireless environment is the new up and coming technology. The e-books will be the textbook of the future. These tools are becoming increasingly affordable. As HEITC looks at wireless technology, the environment needs to be studied for upgrades and licensing.

Future discussion: funding formula and schools who do not have funds for a teacher/librarian.

Regional Technology Advisors the next stage or concept is to think about support and maintenance issues from a region's perspective, and to look at what roles our colleges and universities can play regarding technology in the K12 schools and small rural districts. It was suggested a discussion take place about state of the art call centers, with a certain amount of outreach and different levels of services. There are opportunities to build on existing relationships that the colleges and universities can provide for schools. The RTAs have agreed to come back to the committee with some suggestions for discussion.

Gary Graves gave a brief description of his background and work. There is a need for ideas and general assistance/support in developing Idaho's K20 plan. He described Wyoming's K20 plan, and technology plan scoring rubric by which they can evaluate any technology that comes into the department. Gary also assisted Montana's planning.

A description of two different groups that met to try and establish a K20 plan was discussed. The agency and institutions strategic plans were read to identify the key elements. A summary of the key elements from all the plans created was reviewed. To merge, summarize, or synthesize all the technology elements into something meaningful to represent a technology plan for higher education is the task at hand.

Task: the Board's 4 goals, K12 eight goals, and all the institution and agency goals, need to merge to create a K20 plan. There has been considerable thinking, planning, and elements created to put together a K20 plan, it now only needs to be organized. A suggestion was made and agreed upon to change the term K20 to K-Life, which encompasses all entities, including Libraries. The (K12) Connections Plan was distributed and discussed. It was noted that some elements of the Connections plan no longer apply for today's technology.

The items pulled out of the strategic plans showed uses of technology meeting broader goals. Particularly, these items emphasized effective integration and instruction supported by technology. The common theme discussed was the need to plan for sustainable systems, training, and integration.

The committee discussed Higher Education funding. A request of $50,000 will be presented to the ICTL for the creation and distribution of a K-Life plan, and $15,000 for operating expenses. Utilizing technology to present this plan will be studied. A suggestion was made and a vision discussed to have the plan on line, and create a CD Rom and brochure.

A brainstorming planning session took place, and the following document (technology planning elements) is the result of that session. A hard copy of this draft document was printed and handed out. Gary comments (in red) were added to the document, and an update will be e-mailed to each member. A planning meeting will be held February 1st, 2001. This meeting will be held at the University of Idaho Boise Center, A-1 2nd Floor – 8-3 pm.

SBOE	CRITICAL COMPONENTS (GOALS)	OBJECTIVES	K12
Guiding Visions or Purposes: Economic Development, improved education for all learners, cost savings, meet growing areas of contention: Early Childhood, Special Needs, Equity. Social and cultural development. Global connectivity. Lifelong Learning. **Functional Purposes/Operational Purposes:** • **Seek Funding** • **Increase collaboration** (I can't remember what kind of collaboration we discussed.) • **Allocate resources (more comprehensively)** • **Provide focus, help set direction (for technology related projects)** • **Help establish priorities and a timeline to achieve goals. (Maybe a subset of the prior bullet)** • **Communicate technology vision to various audience and legislators, etc (This is a good one!)**			
I. Quality II. Access III. Efficiency IV. Relevance	The team did a thoughtful job of identifying these key Goals of a tech. plan. Collaboration within Idaho Education and Outside (Quality, Efficiency)	Incentive, Sustainable, Infrastructure, Scalable Upgradeable, Evolvable, Inter-developmental, Day and time, Staffing Administrative Teacher Technology Support (These are good points at one level of detail lower/below the Goals)	Integration 1 Compatibility 2 Collaboration 3, 4 Efficiency 5, 6, 7, 8 (I am not sure if these collapse this neatly.)
	Assessment of impact on learners (Quality and Efficiency, Relevance)		

Higher Education Information Technology Committee
Technology Planning Elements
K-Life Plan
From planning meeting on 12/13/00

	Distance Learning-Support. (Relevance, Access) Vision of teaching, learning, and environment(s) (Quality, Relevance)	Anticipate the Future of the tech "stuff" to focus energy and make more effective use of new tech. developments. Help establish priorities and a timeline to achieve goals.	
	Relevant High Quality Content (Relevance)		
	Training/Professional Development/Support – Help, Library, C&I Design, (Quality, Efficiency)	Plan functions Funding collaboration. Resources allocation Provide focus, help, sect direction Identify priority and time to achieve Communicate technology vision to various audience and legislators, etc.	
	Ubiquitous Access, Location, Anytime, anyplace, and anywhere (Access)		
	Training – Professional Development Support- help, library, C&I design (Quality, Efficiency)		
	Provide human centered support.		

Idaho K-Life Tech Plan

GG	Annotations on the meeting notes	(Note: without K-12 or IDE represented at this meeting on the 12/13, it is hard for me to think of this as a K-Life plan. This is a follow-on idea to my comment about the problem of going too long without all players at the table.)	
Nancy Ann	Plan Timelines (Is it possible to project some likely, working dates for this project? Will Rich need to be involved to do this? If the Lab does enter into a contract for this work, we will need to know deliverables and dates.)		
	Next Step		
	Meeting February 1, 2001	Higher Education – University of Idaho – A1 until 8-3 pm Boise Center, 2nd floor, Boise	
Nancy	Inform Provosts and Presidents		
	Audience: Legislator Decision makers Educators Public, Community, and Parents		